

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/091,567 03/07/2002		Jonathan P. Wong	NEL-006	7851
23353	7590 06/03/2003			
RADER FIS	HMAN & GRAUER P	EXAMINER		
	FREET N.W., SUITE 50	HILL, MYRON G		
WASHINGTO	DN, DC 20036		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1648	11
			DATE MAILED: 06/03/2003	()

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	Ν.	Applicant(s)					
		10/091,567		WONG ET AL.					
Office Action Su	mmary	Examiner		Art Unit					
	·	Myron G. Hill		1648					
The MAILING DATE of to Period for Reply	his communication app	ears on the co	over sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS - Extensions of time may be available und after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing of	er the provisions of 37 CFR 1.15 date of this communication.	36(a). In no event,	however, may a reply be tim	nely filed					
If the period for reply specified above is I If NO period for reply is specified above, Failure to reply within the set or extender Any reply received by the Office later that earned patent term adjustment. See 37	the maximum statutory period v d period for reply will, by statute in three months after the mailing	vill apply and will ex . cause the applicat	pire SIX (6) MONTHS from ion to become ABANDONE	the mailing date of this or D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	/. ommunication.				
Status									
1) Responsive to commur			- 5:al	`					
2a) This action is FINAL.	,	is action is no			a marita ia				
3) Since this application is closed in accordance w	s in condition for allowarith the practice under	Ex parte Qua	or formal matters, pr yle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.	e ments is				
Disposition of Claims	nding in the application	n .		•					
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	 ✓ Claim(s) 8-19 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration. 								
5) Claim(s) is/are al	,				•				
8) Claim(s) are subj		r election requ	uirement.						
Application Papers		•							
9) The specification is object	cted to by the Examine	r.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on _	is/are: a)□ acce	pted or b) 🔲 ob	jected to by the Exa	miner.					
Applicant may not reques									
11)☐ The proposed drawing co	orrection filed on	_ is: a) <u> </u>	roved b) disappro	oved by the Examin	er.				
If approved, corrected dra	awings are required in re	ply to this Office	e action.						
12) The oath or declaration is	s objected to by the Ex	aminer.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 a			·						
13) Acknowledgment is made	de of a claim for foreig	n priority unde	r 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	a)-(d) or (f).					
a)	None of:		•	•					
1. Certified copies o	f the priority document	s have been r	eceived.						
-	f the priority document								
	ified copies of the prion the International Bu	ıreau (PCT Rı	ıle 17.2(a)).		Stage				
14) Acknowledgment is made	•		•		I application)				
a) ☐ The translation of th									
15) Acknowledgment is made									
Attachment(s)									
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-89) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra Information Disclosure Statement(s 	wing Review (PTO-948)	S 5)		y (PTO-413) Paper No Patent Application (PT					
									

Art Unit: 1648

DETAILED ACTION

Newly submitted claims 14- 17 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: Claims 14- 17 are drawn to a liposome formulation, method of encapsulating and product made by the method. The original claims were drawn to a polynucleotide vaccine, method of cloning a plasmid, and method of inducing an immune response with the plasmid.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 14- 17 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

This action is on claims 8- 13, 18, and 19, claims 1- 7 have been canceled.

Rejections Withdrawn

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Applicant asserts all rejections moot in light of the cancellation of original claims and discusses the prior art.

The claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, not discussed below are withdrawn.

Art Unit: 1648

Rejections Maintained

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 10 and 11 provide for the use of a liposome-encapsulated DNA vaccine, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd.* v. *Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Art Unit: 1648

Claims 8- 11, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sha.

Sha teaches a DNA vaccine using an influenza HA gene that is encapsulated in liposomes and that it produces a mucosal immunity as show by the IgA antibody response (pages 21- 22Figure 1, page 27 last paragraph- page 28, first paragraph).

Applicant argues that the liposomes taught by Sha are not the same as the present invention. Applicant cites the end portion of the *Results* section to point out that the mice were not protected against challenge.

The arguments have been fully considered and not found persuasive.

The limitation of specific liposomal formulations is not in the claims. The claims are not drawn to specific liposome compositions but to a polynucleotide vaccine. Sha further discusses the results in the *Discussion* section. Sha reiterates the known benefits of liposome delivery of DNA vaccines and that serum antibody and IgA responses were induced in their experiments. IgA is responsible for mucosal immunity. Sha further comments on the lack of protection in the live virus challenge and associates it with experimental design and not vaccine failure. Sha states that in their hands liposomes enhanced serum immune response including IgA in the saliva (page 27, about the fourth line from the end).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 1648

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sha and Promega Catalog.

These claims remain rejected for the reasons of record applied to claims 4 and 5 in the prior Office Action. Applicant provides no argument against Promega Catalog and the argument on Sha is discussed above in the rejection of claims 8- 11, 17, and 18.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1648

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Myron G. Hill whose telephone number is 703-308-4521. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-6pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Housel can be reached on 703-308-4247. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4242 for regular communications and 703-308-4242 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

VIK

Myron G. Hill Patent Examiner May 29, 2003

JAMES HOUSEL 6/2/03 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600